RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
MAR 2 7 2007

REMARKS

The Final Office Action dated February 2, 2007 has been received and carefully noted. Claims 1-3, 6-8 and 10 were examined. Claims 1-3, 6-8 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Claims 1 and 3 are amended and claim 11 has been added. Entry is requested. Support for added and amended claims can be found in the specification at, for example, FIG.8 and page 12, line 14 – page 13, line 4. As such, no new matter has been added or the scope expanded. Claims 4, 5 and 9 remain cancelled in this response. Claims 1-3, 6-8, 10 and 11 remain pending in the application.

Reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested in view of the claim amendments and the following remarks.

I. Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0063041 to Kurashima et al. (hereinafter "*Kurashima*") in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0137551 by Toba (hereinafter "*Toba*"). To establish a prima facie case of obviousness: (1) there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference; (2) there must be a reasonable expectation of success; and (3) the references when combined must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. *MPEP § 2142*. Applicant respectfully submits that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established.

With regard to amended independent claim 1, it includes the limitation that a different portion of the display panel driver is enabled by the display panel driving unit depending on which one of the display panels is activated. Only that part of the display panel driver which is required to drive a particular display panel is active based on which panel is active. As conceded by Examiner (*Office Action, page 2, last paragraph*). *Kurashima* does not disclose a single display panel driver for both the panels. Thus, *Kurashima* does not teach or suggest this limitation. Moreover, *Toba* does not cure this defect. *Toba* discloses a two panel fold type mobile terminal apparatus with a single LCD driver 25 in Fig. 7. But this LCD driver 25 is same for both the display units and the output of this driver is switched between the two display panels

by the switches SW1 and SW2. The driver itself does not switch the portion of itself that is used based on the display panel it is driving. Thus, *Toba* does not teach or suggest that a different portion of the display panel driver is enabled by the single display panel driving unit depending on which one of the display panels is activated. Examiner does not indicate and Applicant has been unable to discern any other sections of *Kurashima* or *Toba* that teach or suggest such a limitation. Therefore, the cited references do not singularly or in combination, teach or suggest each of the elements of claim 1. Applicant respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kurashima* in view of *Tuba.*

Similarly, the remainder of the rejections in the Office Action mailed February 2, 2007 are obviousness rejections of dependent claims where the primary reference is *Kurashima.* Claims 2, 3, 6-8 and 10 depend from independent claim 1 and incorporate the limitations thereof. Thus, at least for the reasons mentioned above, discussed in regard to the independent claim 1, the primary reference that is relied upon by Examiner does not teach or suggest each of the elements of these claims. Further, additional references that the Examiner seeks to combine with the primary reference do not cure the defects of the primary reference that have been previously identified. The Examiner does not indicate and the Applicants have been unable to discern any part of the additional references, namely U.S. Patent No. 6,583,770 issued to Antila et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,874,928 issued to Kou, or U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/01111200 by Nikawa et al. that cure these defects of the primary reference. Each of the combinations of these references fails to teach all the elements of claims 1, as amended, and consequently fails to teach or suggest each of the elements of the dependent claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of these dependent claims are requested.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAR 2 7 2007

CONCLUSION

In view of the remarks made above, it is respectfully submitted that pending claims 1-3, 6-8, 10 and 11 define the subject invention over the prior art of record. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that all the pending claims are in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: 3/27, 2007

Eric Hyman Reg. No. 30,139

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025
(310) 207-3800

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this paper is being transmitted via facsimile to the Patent and Trademark Office, Commissioner for Patents, Post Office Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450, on 3-27-07

Melissa Stead 3-27-07

Melissa Stead